REMARKS

Regarding the amendment filed on July 5, 2006 (which was not entered), the applicants hereby request that said amendment not be entered.

The applicants have carefully studied the Office Action dated May 4, 2006. By virtue of this amendment, claims 1, 5, 9, 10, 14 and 18 are amended; claims 22 and 23 are withdrawn, and new claims 24, 25, 26 and 27 are added. Claims 1, 5, 9, 10, 14, 18, 24, 25, 26 and 27 are currently pending.

Election/Restrictions

The applicants hereby withdraw claims 22 and 23 from consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the applicants regard as the invention is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to claims 1 and 10, and for the following reasons.

The Examiner stated in the most recent Office Action, "is unclear how one can access information and yet have the information blocked." The following description is submitted in response to the Examiner's uncertainty.

The ***first step*** of the method of amended claim 1, recites accessing encrypted multimedia content for the purpose of decrypting (see third step) the multimedia content. The multimedia content is intended to be subsequently played (see fourth step) on the end-user device by using multimedia **out**put devices and/or ports. Note, however, that the multimedia content is not rendered, or played, at the first step.

At the ***second step*** of amended claim 1, all multimedia **in**put devices and/or ports are "opened", thereby making all multimedia **in**put devices and/or ports unavailable to the end-user device. Note that when a port is being used by a software application, such as a wavein device driver, it considered is "opened". When a port is "opened", access to

the port is by another application is blocked. Conversely, when a port is not being used, and, therefore, is available to be accessed by an application, the port is considered "closed". A multimedia **in**put device and/or port is typically used for the *original* recording of audio or video signals received directly from a microphone or camera connected to the **in**put device and/or port. However, multimedia **in**put devices and/or ports can be used for the *re*-recording of signals outputted from multimedia **out**put devices and/or ports. The claimed invention prevents multimedia **in**put devices and/or ports from receiving signals outputted from multimedia **out**put devices and/or ports. The second step of amended claim 1 also recites that all multimedia **in**put devices and/or ports are blocked prior to decryption of the encrypted multimedia content, to prevent the re-recording of decrypted multimedia content by the end-user device.

The ***third step*** of amended claim 1 recites that at least part of the encrypted multimedia content (which was accessed in the first step) is decrypted.

At the ***fourth step*** of amended claim 1, the now decrypted (formerly encrypted) multimedia content is rendered, or played. Note that the multimedia content is "in the clear" when it is rendered, or played, because the fourth step of amended claim 1 occurs subsequent to the decryption that occurred during the third step of amended claim 1.

The claimed invention prevents using multimedia **in**put devices and/or ports for **re**-recording multimedia content that is being concurrently outputted "in the clear" from multimedia **out**put devices and/or ports.

To more specifically respond to the Examiner's stated uncertainties in the interpretation of the limitations of claim 1, please note that:

The accessing of the multimedia content is **not** blocked.

Access to all multimedia **in**put devices and/or ports **is** blocked.

Access to all multimedia **out**put devices and/or ports is **not** blocked.

The explanations set forth above regarding amended claim 1, is also applicable to amended claim 10.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the applicants believe that the rejection of claims 1 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112 has been overcome. The applicants request that the Examiner allow amended claims 1 and 10.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Owashi et al., (U.S. patent application publication 2004/0190857) hereinafter "Owashi", and further in view of Farwell et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,751,712) hereinafter "Farwell" is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the claims and for the following reasons.

Applicants agree with the Examiner that Owashi does not disclose blocking all multimedia content input devices and/or input ports connected to an end-user system. However, applicants disagree with the Examiner that it would be obvious to modify Owashi to include blocking all multimedia content input devices and/or input ports connected to an end-user system, as taught by Farwell, for the following reasons.

Owashi inhibits the making of a copy of an encrypted digital signal by changing the encryption scheme in a manner that inhibits making a copy of the digital signal, i.e., "changing at least one bit of information bits of the time stamp contained in the reproduced packet signal". See the last portion of paragraph 014 and the last portion of paragraph 015 of Owashi, at the top of page two of Owashi. On the other hand, the claimed invention does not change the encryption scheme of multimedia content in order to prevent copying of the encrypted multimedia content.

The "blocking" referred to in Farwell is actually a "blocking probability". Farwell does not teach the purposeful blocking of a multimedia media call. Just the opposite. Farwell teaches a method of avoiding the inadvertent blocking of a multimedia call in a communication system. On the other hand, the claimed invention does purposefully block the use of input ports of multimedia output devices. In the communication system of Farwell, a certain number of channels of an ISDN PRI facility 117 are allocated to each particular type of traffic, e.g., audio, video or data. The "blocking probability" for a particular type of media traffic is defined "as the likelihood that such traffic would be blocked because of the unavailability of system resources (the bandwidth of facility 117 in this instance) allocated thereto". See Col. 4, lines 20-28 of Farwell. To avoid the unwanted occurrence of the blocking of a particular media type during a call, Farwell teaches allocating a number of channels to that media type based

upon a predetermined probability that the respective media type would be blocked. See claim 1 of Farwell. On the other hand, the claimed invention is designed to intentionally block the playing of any part of an encrypted multimedia content by an end-user device.

The combination of Owashi and Farwell does not teach, disclose or suggest the second step of amended claims 1 or 10, to wit:

> *"prior to decryption of the encrypted multimedia content, blocking access to all multimedia content input devices and/or ports of the end-user device, the blocking being accomplished by opening all multimedia content input devices and/or ports of the end-user device that can receive any part of a multimedia content, to prevent use of all such multimedia content input devices and/or ports, thereby preventing re-recording of decrypted multimedia content by the end-user device"*

In view of the foregoing remarks, the applicants believe that the rejection of claims 1 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome. The applicants request that the Examiner allow amended claims 1 and 10.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 5 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Owashi et al., (U.S. patent application publication 2004/0190857) and further in view of Baugh et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,815,553) is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the claims and for the following reasons.

Applicants agree with the Examiner that the Owashi reference does not disclose completing the rendering of the at least a part of the multimedia content; closing all waveout devices and/or ports that were used for rendering; and closing all wavein devices and/or ports that were opened during rendering. However, applicants disagree with the Examiner that it would be obvious to modify Owashi to include completing the rendering of the at least a part of the multimedia content; closing all waveout devices and/or ports that were used for rendering; and closing all wavein devices and/or ports that were

opened during rendering such as that taught by the Baugh reference in order to have the capability to close and open the devices at times such as the beginning, middle or end of recording to protect the data being recorded. Applicants disagree with the Examiner for the following reason.

Baugh discloses a voice communication system that opens input devices and/or ports in order to use such input devices and/or ports. The method of applicants' claimed invention, on the other hand, opens input devices and/or ports in order that such input devices and/or ports not be used. The input devices and/or ports of applicants' claimed invention are opened in order to block, or inhibit, use of such ports.

Furthermore, claims 5 and 14 depend upon independent claims 1 and 10, respectively, and because dependent claims recite all the limitations of the independent claim, it is believed, for this additional reason, that dependent claims 5 and 14 also recite in allowable form. Therefore, applicants believe that the rejection of claims 5 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome, and applicant requests that the Examiner allow claims 5 and 14.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 9 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Owashi et al., (U.S. patent application publication 2004/0190857) and further in view of Silverbrook et al., (U.S. application publication 2005/0218236) is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the claims and for the following reasons.

Claims 9 and 18 depend upon amended independent claims 1 and 10, respectively, and because dependent claims recite all the limitations of the independent claim, it is believed that dependent claims 9 and 18 also recite in allowable form.

Therefore, applicants believe that the rejection of claims 9 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome, and applicant requests that the Examiner allow amended claims 9 and 18.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application and the claims are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The applicants acknowledge the continuing duty of candor and good faith to disclose information known to be material to the examination of this application. In accordance with 37 CFR §1.56, all such information is dutifully made of record. The foreseeable equivalents of any territory surrendered by amendment are limited to the territory taught by the information of record. No other territory afforded by the doctrine of equivalents is knowingly surrendered and everything else is unforeseeable at the time of this amendment by the applicants and their attorneys.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number below should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 4, 2006

By: _____

Jon A. Gibbons
Registration No. 37,333
Attorney for Applicants

Fleit, Kain, Gibbons, Gutman, Bongini & Bianco P.L.
551 NW 77th Street, Suite 111
Boca Raton, Florida 33487
Telephone: (561) 989-9811
Facsimile: (561) 989-9812